



FORUM ON TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT

FORUM MEETING

November 29, 2005

Draft Report – Conclusions – Tom Warne and Lisë Stewart

Tom reviewed each of the following proposed Forum Conclusions that were based on the Forum's report materials.

- A. Idaho will continue to grow at an historic pace.**
- B. Transportation is critical to the state's economy.**
- C. Transportation must be addressed at all levels of government and among all jurisdictions.**
- D. Increased transportation funding is not a challenge to be delayed to the future.**
- E. Federal funding cannot be relied upon to solve Idaho's transportation funding challenges.**
- F. Idaho's transportation needs in the next 30 years are in excess of \$20 billion.**
- G. Idaho's funding shortfall from FY2005 through FY2035 is over \$200 million a year.**
- H. Public transportation must be addressed as part of Idaho's comprehensive transportation solution for the future.**
- I. Idaho's current fuel tax is inadequate to address the pressing transportation funding needs over the next 30 years.**
- J. The answer to Idaho's transportation funding challenge lies not in a single solution, but rather in adopting a menu of revenue sources to address both state and local needs and all modes of transportation.**
- K. Freight movement in Idaho is an important element of Idaho's transportation future.**
- L. Solutions to Idaho's transportation funding challenge may require innovative and non-traditional revenue sources and means of collection.**
- M. Idaho must recognize the eventual transition from motor fuel to alternative fueled vehicles and prepare accordingly.**

The members made many suggestions, corrections, etc. The Conclusions will be revised and emailed to the Members for further review prior to the Preliminary Final Report.

Pg 2 of the Conclusions – Mary Barker asked if it was Boise or the Boise urban area that was the 7th fastest growing area in the nation.

Scott Burpee asked if there was information available on the increased tonnage hauled through the state. Tom Warne stated that he thought that 10-15% growth rate was reasonable.

Elaine Clegg wanted to see some background information that ties transportation to land use. Cecil Ingram felt that every city has this same issue but there is no statute or comment to address it. There needs to be greater consideration given to these things. Tom Warne agreed to somehow weave it into the report and suggested Conclusion C. Elaine suggested it be tied into the Efficiency Section as well.

Dave Carlson asked if tourism information was in the report since it is the 2nd largest industry in the state. Patrick Armstrong suggested using ARTBA statistical information.

Conclusion C – Dixie asked that the “state’s highway network” be changed to “State roadway network” so it includes local highways.

Elaine Clegg suggested that some statement regarding the transit network/gap be added here or possibly in Conclusion H. Mary Barker can help with this.

Conclusion D – Dick Jacobson suggested that we make a more positive statement in the title. See notes on page –cite report – combine A & C Elaine Clegg suggested using Roadway funding instead of transportation funding in the heading.

Conclusion E – check to see if it’s 2008 or 2009 HTF will have negative balance. Rodger Sorenson asked that we don’t jeopardize the GARVEE program and be prepared for some backlash from the legislature with this report. Report should have some GARVEE discussion modification. Jim Kempton suggested that the last sentence should not forecast what the federal tax situation will be. Tom Warne stated that he believes the funds we get today will be nearly the same or less than the level we received in 2005, however the feds won’t bail us out. People will want to know how much of the \$203 Million is covered by the GARVEE program. Patrick Armstrong suggested that we remind people GARVEE isn’t additional funding – just a method of accelerating projects. Tom Warne suggested adding another bullet there and asked that Charles Rountree review it.

Conclusion G - no additional comments.

Dixie Reid asked if the \$2 Million asked for by the railroads was included in the \$203 Million. Tom Warne noted that it is not included in the total.

Conclusion H – Ron Binggeli wanted to clarify that no dedicated state revenue is available in Idaho for public transit. He suggested putting in more examples in this section of areas outside Ada County that support public transportation. Elaine suggested including facts from the state. Charles Rountree said the state has that study available. Tom Dale suggested adding something on local option taxes, however Elaine Clegg stated that all cities don’t have the ability to do local option taxes. She will get some additional wording to Susan. Bob Hardgrove cautioned the group not to rely too heavily on local option taxes. Dixie Reid felt the need to embrace local option but not limit it to one thing. Ron Binggeli requested adding something on local option taxing ability just as an observation, not a recommendation. Dixie Reid was comfortable with that. She also has a Kootenai County study that could be included in Conclusion H. Dave Carlson suggested the Vision Report done by ITD would also be good in this section. Susan Bale noted that the Vision Report will be in the Appendix Section. Dave Carlson suggested that a single statement in the report would still be advisable, even if the full report is in the Appendix. Charles Rountree agreed that he would favor a couple of sentences in this section. Use conclusions from previous studies; Task Force Report and Charlie’s numbers and statistics to add emphasis for statewide support for PT funding. Rodger Soreson questioned the statement in Conclusion H concerning 80% of Ada County population were surveyed about public transportation. Kelli Fairless stated that it was a statistically valid public opinion survey of 600 households in Ada and Canyon County, not 80% of the population of Ada County. Tom Warne suggested he could clarify the statement that it was a survey of Ada County households. . Elaine Clegg and Darrell Manning asked for more detail about the survey question. Kelli stated that most routes are based near activity centers and the survey question suggested that if a higher level of service was available (15 minute frequencies), would they ride the bus. The level of service offered in the question is much higher than the level now in service.

Cecil Ingram commented that he thought there should be something that addressed taking drivers licenses for petty crimes because we don’t have driving options and this practice has unintended consequences. Tom Warne felt this was a social issue and not to be addressed in the report

Conclusion I – Jim Kempton stated that he will be rewriting the section on indexing. Paul Sudmeier questioned the statement that “25¢ gas taxes is inadequate” is incorrect – it contradicts Dwight Bower ‘s statement on page 66 – doesn’t take into account the other funding options. Patrick Armstrong added that fuel tax is part on the picture, not the entire solution. Tom Warne added that he will include all sources in the report and wording about balancing revenue stream by increasing fuel tax and other fees too.

Maybe change ineffective; don't focus on regression method; also have others – CPI, etc – unique to fuel tax; revenue from other sources – gas tax in line with national average. Bob Hardgrove added that fuel tax doesn't buy the same as in the 1990's. Paul Sudmeier suggested that the other fees are too low and we should structure user fees to 100% variable – our investment in infrastructure needs to be funded with all these fees.

Tom Warne asked the Members what message we want to send here. Elaine suggested that historically we relied on fuel taxes, but now's the time to review and adjust fuel and other taxes/fees. Consensus was that Conclusion J says that. Elaine Clegg suggested that we still need a policy statement. Jim Kempton suggested we combine J & I using the bolded J heading as the title. Paul Sudmeier suggested that raising fuel taxes will cause border problems and doesn't see that more than 5-6¢ increase would be acceptable. Elaine Clegg requested that it should be mentioned that Idaho fuel tax is dedicated to roadways. Tom Warne said it will be put back in the public transit section.

Conclusion J – Dixie Reid noted that the list on page 9 doesn't relate back to the previous list of potential revenue sources. Tom Warne said it should be the same list of items as on page 74 of the report.

Tom Warne asked if Monte McClure's comments about funding sources available for everyone were worked into these items. Monte felt they were covered under J. – just make sure any one source is available to all jurisdictions. Dave Carlson suggested that the legislature should give the opportunity to allow local option funding at the local level. Tom Warne stated it could be worked into Conclusion J. Cecil Ingram suggested looking at the 1995 Interim Committee/Resources Task Force to see if these recommendations correlate with those studies, to see if we missed something.

Conclusion K – Scott Burpee felt that the increase in barge traffic should be addressed in this section. Charles Rountree said the state has statistics on barge/port traffic. Dixie Reid felt the report should talk about how important multi-modal/freight traffic is but don't include rail's \$2 Million because the statement implies an investment. Susan Bale stated that a broad statement could be added to D. Dixie suggested that we take out "modest investment" in D. Tom agreed with the suggestion. Modify D's wording – add freight efficiency – E.

Paul Sudmeier requested a statement concerning a change in the load limits. Rodger Sorenson recalled the spirited discussion but stated that the Members did not make a recommendation on that. Patrick Armstrong suggested that the State could offer some incentives for private companies to develop new facilities. Tom Warne said a general statement could be added in.

Conclusion L – Mayor Tom Dale suggested making the title statement to read will instead of may require innovative revenue sources. Dixie Reid suggested that we clarify that it is on each jurisdiction (there's 300 transportation jurisdictions) instead of each agency dealing with transportation. Tom Warne suggested that it be each class of jurisdiction. Jim Kempton will reword this section.

Conclusion M – Mayor Tom Dale suggested the words "motor fuel" be replaced with "gasoline and diesel". Elaine Clegg felt there needed to be additional information on alternative vehicles. Dave Carlson suggested that fuel usage should be benchmarked and use be monitored every year. Your notes: benchmark increase in fuel costs – dynamic process – will need to revisit/review?